

The School District of Lee County

Varsity Lakes Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Varsity Lakes Middle School

801 GUNNERY RD N, Lehigh Acres, FL 33971

<http://vlm.leeschools.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Chevone ESE Anderson Thomas

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Varsity Lakes Middle School

801 GUNNERY RD N, Lehigh Acres, FL 33971

<http://vlm.leeschools.net/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	96%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	84%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Varsity Lakes Middle School will provide a nurturing environment that ensures the continued development of the whole student. Through challenging learning experiences, all students will mature academically, socially, physically, emotionally, and creatively.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Varsity Lakes Middle School is a learning institute that is dedicated to the creation of academic excellence through rigorous, engaging instruction and integrated curriculum.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Woelke, Carol	Principal	
Weicht, Anysia	Teacher, K-12	
Shaw, Michelle	Instructional Coach	
Thompson, April	Assistant Principal	
Hendrick, Brandon	Assistant Principal	
Doucette, Brenda	Teacher, ESE	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Chevone ESE Anderson Thomas

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
--	--------

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	402	413	441	0	0	0	0	1256	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	24	34	0	0	0	0	95	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	43	44	0	0	0	0	98	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	2	18	0	0	0	0	65	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	21	0	0	0	0	38	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	101	90	0	0	0	0	268	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	91	95	0	0	0	0	267	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	73	91	0	0	0	0	236

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 10/26/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	119	127	0	0	0	0	309	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	57	85	0	0	0	0	196	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	20	26	0	0	0	0	70	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	47	12	0	0	0	0	92	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	149	157	154	0	0	0	0	460	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	119	127	0	0	0	0	309	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	119	127	0	0	0	0	309
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	57	85	0	0	0	0	196
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	20	26	0	0	0	0	70
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	47	12	0	0	0	0	92
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	149	157	154	0	0	0	0	460

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	119	127	0	0	0	0	309

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	53%	55%	54%	55%	55%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	56%	54%	56%	58%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	44%	47%	42%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	52%	64%	58%	64%	60%	56%
Math Learning Gains	48%	64%	57%	64%	62%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	54%	51%	47%	50%	50%
Science Achievement	40%	50%	51%	46%	49%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	64%	70%	72%	71%	67%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	50%	52%	-2%	54%	-4%
	2018	52%	51%	1%	52%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	53%	51%	2%	52%	1%
	2018	48%	50%	-2%	51%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
08	2019	54%	57%	-3%	56%	-2%
	2018	56%	56%	0%	58%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	31%	47%	-16%	55%	-24%
	2018	36%	41%	-5%	52%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	56%	57%	-1%	54%	2%
	2018	69%	65%	4%	54%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		20%				
08	2019	34%	60%	-26%	46%	-12%
	2018	21%	47%	-26%	45%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	38%	46%	-8%	48%	-10%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	47%	48%	-1%	50%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	63%	67%	-4%	71%	-8%
2018	66%	66%	0%	71%	-5%
Compare		-3%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	91%	59%	32%	61%	30%
2018	94%	60%	34%	62%	32%
Compare		-3%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	50%	-50%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	53%	-53%	56%	-56%
Compare		0%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	13	34	32	16	28	25	4	30	40		
ELL	30	44	33	30	33	25	17	26	43		

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
ASN	70	63		75	68				73		
BLK	47	49	39	41	39	34	27	61	70		
HSP	51	54	41	50	47	34	40	58	72		
MUL	65	77		55	58			69			
WHT	62	61	52	70	57	51	52	85	77		
FRL	46	51	41	44	42	33	37	54	66		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	12	32	25	21	40	37	10	24			
ELL	15	39	42	30	47	35	15	38			
ASN	67	62		86	67						
BLK	41	45	42	42	46	38	33	60	79		
HSP	49	50	39	55	52	42	45	65	77		
MUL	52	50		59	48		45				
WHT	72	59	43	79	72	50	73	79	86		
FRL	48	49	39	52	52	41	42	64	76		
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	10	35	36	18	35	32	5	27			
ELL	20	49	40	33	45	40	7	37			
ASN	84	72		89	89						
BLK	43	49	36	45	55	45	38	57	70		
HSP	52	55	42	63	64	48	39	69	74		
MUL	76	50		86	65			80			
WHT	75	67	68	86	71	41	69	88	75		
FRL	46	50	38	55	59	45	35	59	71		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	49
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	512
Total Components for the Federal Index	10

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	33
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	70
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	45
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	50
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	65
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	63
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Across all content areas and subgroups, our SWD and ELL students were consistently performing lower than the rest of the student population. Specifically, our SWD performed at 24% which has been under the 41% threshold for 2 consecutive years. Some of factors included the high discipline those students had and time out of the classroom.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Our math students were the greatest decline from the prior year in all areas. Proficiency decreased from 57% to 52%; learning gains decreased from 55%-48%; L25 decreased from 41%-36%. There were many new teachers and some of the classes did have a consistent teacher throughout the school year. In addition, our math coach had to take over as testing coordinator part way through the year.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The L25s for our math content area was the greatest gap with the state by 10%. again this would result in the lack of permanent teachers and the math coach being pulled at the semester for testing.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

ELA Learning Gains saw the strongest gains, rising from 51% to 55%. This was also one area that surpassed the state average. Through PLC and PD, ELA teachers developed strength and consistency in data analysis and differentiated instruction through standards.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Referring back to the ESSA data, students with disabilities and ELL students showed the lowest growth and performed lower than the general population. (add L25)

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Increase Math learning gains
2. Increase Science Proficiency
3. Develop strategies to assist the SWD and ELL population for learning gains
4. Decrease number of students who have out of school suspension

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: L25s in the categories of ELL and SWD will be areas of focus in order to increase student achievement based on data from FY20.

Measurable Outcome: ELL and SWD performance data will increase to 42% in FY21.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Carol Woelke (carolaw@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Progress monitoring data in all areas will be used to drive instructional decisions during PLCs to increase supports for low performing ESSA subgroup students at our school. Social Emotional learning opportunities will be utilized to increase social emotional wellness among our student body.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Data driven decision making has been proven to be an effective strategy for increasing student achievement. PLCs teams can make stronger connections with students to increase attendance and decrease discipline, which will improve student achievement. It is also important to focus on social and emotional wellness for our student body to increase their ability to focus on learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Data driven PLCs to drive instruction.
2. Analysis of discipline and attendance data during PLCs to increase supports.
3. Provide social and emotional wellness learning opportunities to increase ability to focus on learning.
4. Provide tutoring for increased academic support.

Person Responsible: Carol Woelke (carolaw@leeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: In reviewing FSA data from 2018-2019 school year and previous school years, there is a trending decline in student learning gains. Proper teacher coaching will ensure productive PLC time with common goals.

Measurable Outcome: Students will increase Math student learning gains from 48%-52% as measured by the FSA Math Assessment for the 2020-2021 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Carol Woelke (carolaw@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: PLC Facilitators will assist teachers with data tracking and discuss during PLC time. (Use of iReady)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: By knowing where the students are throughout grade level by data analysis, teachers can use common materials and assessment to drive their instruction, focusing on the biggest needs and tailoring their instruction to those students. Using common assessments will also give teachers the opportunity to collaborate to increase gains.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Addition of PCTs.
2. Increase and adopt district curriculum maps.
3. Progress monitoring of iReady data.
4. Increase coaching for teachers on scaffolding and spiraling on all levels.
5. Increase rigor and relevance through monthly/quarterly PD and learning walks.
6. Co-teachers in math classrooms per IEP accommodations.
7. Co-teachers/paras in math classrooms for ELL support.
8. Provide tutoring for increased academic support.

Person Responsible Carol Woelke (carolaw@leeschools.net)

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus
Focus Description and Rationale: In reviewing FSA data from 2018-1019 school year and previous school years, there is a trending decline in student learning gains. Proper teacher coaching will ensure productive PLC time with common goals.

Measurable Outcome: Students will increase ELA student learning gains levels from 55%-57% as measured by the FSA ELA Assessment for the 2020-2021 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Carol Woelke (carolaw@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: PLC Facilitators will assist teachers with data tracking and discuss during PLC time. Use of iReady as progress monitoring tool and for differentiation.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: By knowing where the students are throughout grade level by data analysis, teachers can use common materials and assessment to drive their instruction, focusing on the biggest needs and tailoring their instruction to those students. Using common assessments will also give teachers the opportunity to collaborate to increase gains.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Addition of PCTs.
2. Increase and adopt district curriculum maps.
3. Quarterly progress monitoring of STAR data.
4. Increase coaching for teachers on scaffolding and spiraling on all levels.
5. Increase rigor and relevance through monthly/quarterly PD and learning walks.
6. Co-teachers in ELA/Reading classrooms per IEP accommodations
7. Co-teachers in ELA/Reading classrooms for ELL support.
8. Use of iReady for progress monitoring and differentiation.
9. Provide tutoring for increased academic support.

Person Responsible Carol Woelke (carolaw@leeschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus	
Description and Rationale:	In reviewing Science data from 2018-2019 school year and previous school years, there is a trending decline in student achievement. Proper teacher coaching will ensure productive PLC time with common goals.
Measurable Outcome:	Students will increase Science proficiency from 40%-45% as measured by the Science EOC Assessment for the 2020-2021 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Carol Woelke (carolaw@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	PLC Facilitators will assist teachers with data tracking and discuss during PLC time.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By knowing where the students are throughout grade level by data analysis, teachers can use common materials and assessment to drive their instruction, focusing on the biggest needs and tailoring their instruction to those students. Using common assessments will also give teachers the opportunity to collaborate to increase gains.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Addition of PCTs.
2. Increase and adopt district curriculum maps.
3. Quarterly progress monitoring of formative and Performance Matters data.
4. Increase coaching for scaffolding and spiraling for all levels.
5. Increase rigor and relevance through monthly/quarterly PD and learning walks.
6. District PD for support for ELL students on lesson planning and teaching.
7. Targeted tutoring for students who need improvement, specifically small group support per IEP accommodations.
8. Provide tutoring for increased academic support.

Person Responsible Carol Woelke (carolaw@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

VLMS incorporates Positive Behavior Intervention Supports (PBIS). PBIS is a multi-tiered system of support that uses evidence based instruction and interventions. VLMS uses PBIS to teach and reinforce appropriate behaviors and problem solving skills. PBIS supports social emotional learning outcomes for all students to create a positive school culture and environment.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

The School District of Lee County is working toward certification of Marzano's High Reliability levels which is intended to produce a system that has high reliability and becomes transformational in its approach to educating its students. When a school has met the criterion indicators for a specific level in the model, it consistently monitors those indicators and makes immediate corrections when school performance falls below acceptable levels. The first level of school effectiveness is a Safe and Orderly Environment that Supports Cooperation and Collaboration. Our school is currently working through PLCs in leadership to bring forward the knowledge at the school level to begin our study of the leading indicators: (1) The faculty and staff perceive the school environment as safe and orderly. (2) Students, parents, and the community perceive the school environment as safe and orderly. (3) Teachers have formal roles in the decision-making process regarding school initiatives. (4) Teacher teams and collaborative groups regularly interact to address common issues regarding curriculum, assessment, instruction, and the achievement of all students (5) Teachers and staff have formal ways to provide input regarding the optimal functioning of the school. (6) Students, parents, and community have formal ways to provide input regarding the optimal functioning of the school. (7) The success of the whole school, as well as individuals within the school, is appropriately acknowledged (8) The fiscal, operational, and technological resources of the school are managed in a way that directly supports teachers. As this knowledge is put into action, our school will work with teachers, students, parents, and community members to engage in and study the indicators to ensure that the school culture is inclusive and positive.

In addition to the use of Marzano's High Reliability, VLMS incorporates Positive Behavior Intervention Supports (PBIS). PBIS is a multi-tiered system of support that uses evidence based instruction and interventions. VLMS uses PBIS to teach and reinforce appropriate behaviors and problem solving skills. PBIS supports social emotional learning outcomes for all students to create a positive school culture and environment.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				\$100.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	0000	100-Salaries	0242 - Varsity Lakes Middle School	IDEA		\$100.00

2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
Total:			\$100.00